

In the Office Action, claim 14 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raith et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed at least for the following reasons.

Claim 14 defines a method of updating a base station's landline telephone number that is stored in a call routing equipment in preparation for future call routing. The base station has an assigned landline telephone number and a base identification number (BID). The method recites the specific steps, among others, of "finding, by the call routing equipment, the stored base station's landline telephone number according to the BID"; "determining, by the call routing equipment, if the assigned landline telephone number is equal to the stored base station's landline telephone number"; and "updating, by the call routing equipment, the stored base station's landline telephone number with the assigned landline telephone number when the assigned landline telephone number is not equal to the stored base station's landline telephone number."

In contrast, at the lines cited by the Examiner in making the rejection and other lines of the specification, Raith et al. discloses a portable radio terminal that can be used at a subscriber's residence with a residential base radio station. Furthermore the portable radio terminal can be used with a plurality of telepoint radio transceivers. (Col. 6, lines 40-44.) When the portable radio telephone is away from the subscriber's residence and chooses a telepoint radio transceiver of a telepoint station as a serving transmitter, the portable radio terminal informs the residential base radio station of the choice, and sends the network subscriber number of the telepoint station, and possibly the identity of the serving radio transceiver. The residential base radio station stores the network subscriber number of the telepoint station. (Col. 7, lines 13-42.) Thereafter, when a call to the portable radio telephone is received by the residential base radio station, the residential base radio station forwards the call to the telepoint station by using the network subscriber number.

When the portable radio terminal returns to the subscriber's residence, the portable radio terminal chooses the transceiver of the residential base radio station as the serving transmitter. The portable radio terminal sends a message to the residential base radio station, and the residential base radio station changes the stored information accordingly. (Col. 8, line 52, to col. 9, line 2.)

Also disclosed is a PSTN with a call transfer feature for forwarding calls from a called subscriber to another subscriber. (Col. 9, line 30-45.)

Nowhere, however, does Raith et al. disclose or suggest the claimed combination having, among other steps, the step of "finding, by the call routing equipment, the stored base station's landline telephone number according to the BID." This is an important feature of the invention because the BID is the "link" in finding the stored landline telephone number corresponding to the base station. In light of the fact that the claim is broad enough to read on a system where there is a plurality of base stations, and there would be a plurality of stored base station landline telephone numbers, this step is important in finding the appropriate stored landline telephone number.

Although Raith et al. discloses that the "identity of serving radio transceiver" is "possibly" sent by the portable radio terminal along with the network subscriber number of the telepoint station, nowhere does Raith et al. disclose or suggest what the "identity of serving radio transceiver" is used for. Furthermore, the fact that the residential base station merely receives and stores the network subscriber number, and then forwards calls to the stored network subscriber number, suggests that there is no step of finding the stored network subscriber number according to the "identity of serving radio transceiver."

Moreover, Raith et al. does not disclose or suggest the step of "determining, by the call routing equipment, if the assigned landline telephone number is equal to the stored base station's landline telephone number" and "updating, by the call routing equipment, the stored base station's landline telephone number with the assigned landline telephone number when the assigned landline telephone number is not equal to the stored base station's landline telephone number." Rather, at the lines cited by the Examiner for teaching these limitations of the claim, Raith et al. discloses that, when the portable radio terminal returns to the subscriber's residence and sends a message to the residential base radio station, the residential base radio station changes the stored information. Thus, there is no "assigned landline telephone" being sent by the portable radio terminal to compare with stored network subscriber number. Furthermore, even if the portable radio terminal sent an "assigned landline telephone," the fact that the described system merely cancels the call forwarding to the stored network subscriber number suggests that there is no need to determine if the "assigned landline telephone number" is equal to the stored network subscriber number.

For these reasons, method claim 14 and the corresponding apparatus claim 22, are allowable over Raith et al., thus rejection of claims 14 and 22 as being anticipated by Raith et al. should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Raith et al. in view of McDonald. At least by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 14, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Proposed Amendment After Final Under 37 CFR 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 14, 15, and 22 in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the proposed cancellation of claims 16-21 and 23-26 does not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that their claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-4768. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Schellinger et al.

By: Donald C. Kordich  
Donald C. Kordich  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,213  
Phone: (847) 523-2328  
Fax: (847) 523-2350